



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,860	10/17/2001	Ruey-Feng Jean	JCLA6417	7968
7590 12/05/2003				
J.C. Patents, Inc. 4 Venture, Suite 250 Irvine, CA 92618				
EXAMINER GUHARAY, KARABI				
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER				
2879				

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/981,860

Applicant(s)

JEAN ET AL.

Examiner

Karabi Guharay

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment, filed on 09/08/03.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2879

Amendment, filed on September 08, 2003 has been considered and entered.

Amendment of specification and drawings overcome the objection to the drawings and specification.

Corrected drawings, filed on 09/09/03, are approved.

Amendment of claim 8 overcomes the rejection of claims 8-16 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hinotani et al. (US 4920298).

Regarding claims 1, Hinotani et al. disclose a planar fluorescent lamp (Fig 1) comprising of a first panel (6) and a second panel (8) coated with fluorescent layer, a glass rim (glass side wall 20) joined with edges of the first and second panels, wherein the glass rim has plurality of electrode seats (36) and two solid electrode structure, each having an electrode (28 & 30) and two electrode lead (32, 34) at two sides of the electrode (28 & 30) wherein each electrode has a neck region (L shape electrode lead 32 or 34 forms neck region, lines 5-65 of column 3).

Regarding claims 2-3, Hinotani discloses that the electrode (28) includes a planar structure, and the electrode leads (32, 34) include flat panels (see Fig 1, or Fig 2).

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claims 4-5, Hinotani et al. disclose a planar fluorescent lamp (Fig 1) comprising of a first panel (6) and a second panel (8) coated with fluorescent layer, a glass rim (glass side wall 20) joined with edges of the first and second panels, wherein the glass rim has plurality of electrode seats (36) and two solid electrode structures, each having an electrode (28 & 30) and two electrode lead (32, 34) at two sides of the electrode (28, 30), wherein each electrode (28) includes a bent serration structure (38), and the electrode lead (32, 34) has a neck region (L shape electrode lead 32 or 34 forms neck region).

Claim 6 recites essentially the same limitation of claim 3. Thus claim 6 is rejected as claim 3 (see rejection of claim 3).

Regarding claim 7, Hinotani discloses that the glass rim (20) further comprising a gap (24 of Fig 1) for installing a venting tube (26, lines 36-45 of column 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 8-11, 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinotani et al. (US 4920298) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hasegawa (US 5461279).

Regarding claim 8, Hinotani discloses a planar fluorescent lamp (Fig 1) comprising of a first panel (6) and a second panel (8) coated with fluorescent layer, a glass rim (glass side wall 20) joined with edges of the first and second panels, wherein the glass rim has plurality of recesses (36), a first and second rod structure parallel to each other and closely attached to the glass rim (20) via recesses (36).

But Hinotani et al. fail to disclose that the electrode rod is solid.

However, Hasegawa, in the same field of flat fluorescent lamp used a different shape of first and second solid rod electrode structure (14,16 see Fig 1), in order to readily permitting a discharge (lines 1-7 of column 3).

Thus it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use solid rod electrode structure as disclosed by Hasegawa, in the device of Hinotani et al. since this will readily permit a discharge inside the chamber.

Regarding claims 9-10, Hinotani discloses that the first and second rod electrode structure includes an electrode (28, 30) and two leads (32, 34) at two sides of the electrode (see Fig 1).

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claim 11, Hinotani discloses that the first and second rod structures include electrode lead (32, 34) and further include an electrode material (30) encircling the electrode lead (see Fig 2).

Regarding claims 13-14, Hinotani fails to disclose U-shaped or V-shaped recesses in the glass rim (20). However, it is noted that specific U-shape or V-shape of the recess does not solve any of the stated problems or yield any unexpected result that is not within the scope of the teachings applied. Therefore it is considered to be a matter of choice, which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious to select one of the shapes of V-shape, U-shape or rectangular.

Regarding claim 15, Hinotani discloses that the recesses (36) have rectangular cross sections (see Fig 1).

Regarding claim 16, Hinotani discloses that the glass rim (20) further comprising a gap (24 of Fig 1) for installing a venting tube (26, lines 36-45 of column 3).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 09/08/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Amended claim 1 recites a solid electrode structure, however, examiner wants to point out that any geometrical structure or figure having three dimension is called solid structure. Thus Hinotani's electrode structure is a solid electrode structure.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2879

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karabi Guharay whose telephone number is (703) 305-1971. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (703) 305-4794. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 308-7382.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

K. Guharay
Karabi Guharay
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879

VIP Patel
VIP PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER